

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-12, and 14-29 are currently pending. No amendments have been made to Claims 1, 3-12, and 14-29 and these claims remain pending. Accordingly, a request for reconsideration is respectfully requested. Further, Applicants believe that in light of the remarks presented herein, the present application is in condition for allowance and Applicants respectfully request prompt and favorable action. The Examiner is thanked for the careful consideration of the present patent application.

Claims 1, 3, 10-12, 14, and 21-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Son et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/00412292) in view of Aberg (U.S. Patent 6,993,362) and in further view of Will (U.S. Patent 6392640). Claims 4-9 and 15-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Son in view of Aberg in further view of Will and in further view of Kennedy et al. (EP 1193590).

Response to the Rejections of Claims 1, 3, 10-12, and 21-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 10-12, 14, and 21-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Son et al. in view of Aberg and in further view of Will. Claim 1 recites a method of displaying a subset of a plurality of user interface ("UI") elements in a user interface. The method includes (i) determining the size of a first subset of plurality of UI elements that can be displayed within the user interface, (ii) determining a plurality of UI elements that may be selected for display within the user interface, (iii) selecting the first subset of UI elements from the plurality of UI elements determined in step (ii), and (iv) displaying on the user interface and loading into memory the first subset of UI elements selected in step (iii). Further, as recited, as the first subset of UI elements is unselected, the first subset of UI elements are not displayed and

unloaded from memory, and a second subset of UI elements are displayed according to steps (i) through (iv) as performed for the first subset of UI elements.

Son et al. teaches a method of displaying a list of menus on a screen of a mobile phone. Each menu is represented by a menu icon that includes text and a graphical illustration that identifies each menu. As taught by Son et al., “[t]he method includes the steps of entirely displaying an initial menu icon representing one of the list of menus on the screen, displaying a portion of the initial menu icon and a second portion of an adjacent menu icon on the screen when a telephone user presses down a navigation key or an arrow key in a direction toward the adjacent menu icon, and entirely displaying the adjacent menu icon on the screen.” Accordingly, a user may scroll through the menu icons and select a menu by selecting a menu icon.

Unlike Claim 1, Son et al. does not teach determining the size of a first subset of plurality of UI elements that can be displayed within the user interface. In fact, Son et al. makes no mention of determining size of anything in the entire patent application. The Office Action noted “that the size of the ‘Message Menu’ shown in figure 4a is directly proportionate to the size of the display screen.” This statement may be true, but it does not indicate that Son et al. teaches **determining the size of a first subset of plurality of UI elements that can be displayed within the user interface.**

The Office Action states that “Son does not explicitly disclose as the first subset of UI elements is unselected, the first subset of UI elements are not displayed, and a second subset of UI elements are displayed according to steps (i) through (iv) as performed for the first subset of UI elements.” Applicants agree with this statement. However, Applicants disagree that Aberg teaches these steps.

Aberg teaches a mobile telephone that has a display, a user-controlled input device, a memory, and a controller. Further, a hierarchical menu system is stored in the memory. The menu system includes a plurality of menus, including top-level menus, sub-level menus, and a plurality of menu items under respective menus. The controller is arranged to present individual menus/menu items on the display, receive selection commands from a user through the user-controlled input device and in response perform functions related to the presented menus/menu items. The memory of the apparatus has a dynamic menu, the contents of which may be modified by the user. As taught by Aberg, “the user is given an opportunity not only to add new menu items to the dynamic menu but also to remove menu items therefrom.”

The dynamic menu taught by Aberg is dynamic only in the sense that a user may add or remove items from the menu. After, the items are added or removed, the menu is displayed in a typical manner, i.e., a user may scroll through menu items. Aberg does not teach “as the first subset of UI elements is unselected, the first subset of UI elements are not displayed ... and a second subset of UI elements are displayed according to steps (i) through (iv) as performed for the first subset of UI elements.”

The Office Action further indicates that “[n]either Son nor Aberg expressly disclose that the first subset of UI elements are unloaded from memory upon being unselected.” Again, Applicants agree with the Office Action. However, Applicants disagree that Will teaches this element.

Will teaches an improved method and apparatus for entering words with a menu and a thumbwheel. A user can enter a word by selecting a sequence of menu items that each contain the desired sequence of letters. After each selection of a menu item, words are retrieved from the

memory that are consistent with the sequence entered so far. These words are added to the menu and displayed. When the user sees the desired word in the menu, the user may move the thumbwheel to the desired word and selected it using a button press. The word may then be entered, e.g., into a text window. Unselected words are not removed from the memory. Those words remain in the memory as a database to be search when the next character string is entered by the user. If words were removed as suggested by the Office Action, the database of words would be slowly depleted and the invention of Will would be rendered inoperable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited prior art. Moreover, all claims that depend from claim 1 are also patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

For at least the reasons presented herein regarding claim 1, independent claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 are also patentably distinct from the cited prior art. Further, any claims depending from claims 11, 12, 24, and 25 are also patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

Response to the Rejections of Claims 4-9 and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 4-9 and 15-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Son in view of Aberg in further view of Will and in further view of Kennedy et al. (EP 1193590). Claims 4-9 and 15-20 each depend from respective independent claims that, in light of the comments provided herein, are in a condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4-9 and 15-20 are also patentably distinct from the cited prior art. Further any claims that depend from claims 4-9 and 15-20 are also patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

Conclusion

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Dated September 3, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Nicholas A. Cole
Reg. No. 60,957
(858) 658-1834

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-1834
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502